UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Prejudice: An Instinct, a Conditioning, or a Purpose? - *Clarence R. Skinner*

Beyond Ethics - - *Abraham Cronbach*

Fascistic Legislation Faces Congress - - - - - *Jesse M. MacKnight*

The Menace of Righteousness - - - - - *Earl C. Hamilton*

Professions on the Labor Front - *Frank Doane*

The Study Table - - *Alice Stone Blackwell, Robert C. Schaller, John Haynes Holmes, George Maychin Stockdale*

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 9

Chicago, January 6, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 163
Jottings 166

ARTICLES—

Prejudice: An Instinct, a Conditioning, or a Purpose—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 166
Beyond Ethics—ABRAHAM CRONBACH 168
Fascistic Legislation Faces Congress—JESSE M. MACKNIGHT .. 170
The Menace of Righteousness— EARL C. HAMILTON 172
Professions on the Labor Front—FRANK DOANE 174

POETRY—

Tears—*Lizette Woodworth Reese* 163
To Sorrow—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 165
The Magi's Star—JOHN G. BAXTER 169

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Great Book on Russia—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 175
Azrael Over the White House—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 177
Today—and Tomorrow!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 177
Sermons by a Great Preacher—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE .. 178

THE FIELD—

A Letter to the President 162
Some Significant Findings 179
Mrs. Sun Yat Sen Appeals to America 180
Where Logic Limps—*Presbyterian Tribune* 180

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Letter to the President

New Haven, Conn.,
November 29, 1935.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt,
Warm Springs, Georgia.

Dear Mr. President:

You have invited the clergy of the nation to offer "counsel and advice" relative to ways in which "our government can best serve our people."

The National Religion and Labor Foundation has just completed a survey of the social theory and action of religious leaders in the nation, in which 4,700 clergymen representing twenty-two major faiths and denominations responded. The facts gathered from this study, to be published in a few days, together with information available through our close contact with leaders in local situations, give us a basis for a reply to your request.

Thousands of ministers throughout the United States respect your purpose to change the economic situation for the benefit of the working people. They are willing to grant that you have done far more than any previous administration, but they are convinced that you have not gone far enough. They deplore the fact that billions of dollars, necessarily appropriated for relief to the victims of injustice, have been spent without making any basic change in our social order. They know that conditions are still fundamentally unsound.

The facts that confront us do not warrant public utterances that the country is "coming back" in any wholesome sense. Recovery must be measured in terms of what is happening to human life, and not merely in terms of the income of corporations or rising curves indicative of business activity. According to conservative estimates, 10,000,000 people are still unemployed. No fewer than 20,000,000 people are still on relief. Official figures disclose that 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 young people aged sixteen to twenty-five have absolutely no constructive employment. Nearly 3,000,000 of these are on direct relief. We cannot logically refer to the "recent depression," when one-sixth of our people are in danger of becoming permanently unemployable from malnutrition and degeneration from aimless activity.

We hold that there can be no per-

(*Continued on page* 178)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1936 No. 9

A SONNET

[The late Miss Reese wrote much beautiful poetry, the matchless sonnet touched the universal heart, and won her immortality. We print it herewith in tribute to the poet's memory.—Editor.]

TEARS

When I consider Life and its few years—
A wisp of fog betwixt us and the sun;
A call to battle, and the battle done
Ere the last echo dies within our ears;
A rose choked in the grass; an hour of fears;
The gusts that past a darkening shore do beat;
The burst of music down an unlistening street—
I wonder at the idleness of tears.
Ye old, old dead, and ye of yesternight,
Chieftains, and bards, and keepers of the sheep,
By every cup of sorrow that you had,
Loose me from tears, and make me see aright
How each hath back what once he stayed to weep;
Homer his sight, David his little lad!

—Lizette Woodworth Reese.

The uprising of the English people against the outrageous Laval-Hoare peace proposal to Italy, with the resulting embarrassment of the Baldwin cabinet and the throwing of the Foreign Secretary to the wolves of the opposition, we count one of the most heartening events of modern times. There *is* some moral sentiment in the world, after all! The peace proposal, so-called, was a ghastly thing. In essence it meant the bestowal of vast reward upon Italy for her attack upon Ethiopia, and therewith notice to mankind that if any nation wanted to get away with anything, all it had to do was to be sufficiently aggressive and blustery to succeed. It showed that France was traitorously playing the game *with* Mussolini and not against him, that Britain was afraid of Il Duce's military power, and that both France and Britain were willing to scuttle the League of Nations at the drop of a hat. But in England there were people—millions of them!—who believed in the League, and were convinced that the League was the one way to peace. These people had elected Baldwin on the League issue, and thus given him a mandate to sustain the League. And now, before the new Parliament had hardly found their seats, the cabinet was abandoning the cause! What wonder that all England rang with protest against the cowardice and ignominy of this betrayal! This was a magnificent assertion of democratic idealism. Yet do we find ourselves wondering why the English people ever imagined that Baldwin and his Tories would do anything other than what they actually did. Why did the British electorate deceive itself into thinking that their government cherished any real concern for the League or any basic interest in peace, least of all, any genuine reprobation of Mussolini? The Italian dictator was playing a perfectly familiar game. The British rulers had no objection to it except as it threatened the British imperial interests. The moment those interests were safeguarded, as they undoubtedly were by some secret agreement with Italy, they were entirely willing to carve up Ethiopia and let the League go hang. This peace proposal justified everything that Britain's worst enemies have said against her Italian policy. It was time that the English people woke up!

If we were to name one thing more than another that features the famous dead of 1935, it would be the sensational violence with which many of them were taken off. We cannot seem to recall a year in which so many distinguished persons were killed under circumstances which shocked the world. We wonder, as we read the list, if such events are not a certain symptom of an ill, besetting mankind thus even unto death. Who can forget, for example, the dreadful disaster in Alaska, which snatched away the lives of WILL ROGERS, humorist, and WILEY POST, aviator? Nothing quite matched this in all the twelve months past. If anything came close to it, at least in our own country, it was the assassination of HUEY LONG, Senator from Louisiana. This stirred no such lamentation among the general public as the falling of the airplane carrying Rogers and Post, but it was an event of far greater significance in the nation's life. Two European events of similarly shocking character were the killing of QUEEN ASTRID, of Belgium, in her husband's automobile, and the killing of COL. T. E. LAWRENCE on his own motorcycle. The former died instantly, the latter after days of unconsciousness, but both were victims of the modern mania for speed. Another calamitous death, of this same description, was that of SENATOR BRONSON M. CUTTING, of New Mexico, who fell without warning in an airplane. To these may be added SIR CHARLES KINGSFORD-SMITH, English aviator, who disappeared on his long Australian flight, and was never found. Also, MRS. ICKES, wife of the Secretary of the Interior, killed in an automobile accident in the South,

and Dr. W. Bevan Wolfe, psychologist and author, killed in an automobile accident in Europe. Was the death of any one of these persons necessary in the sense that it was unavoidable? We refuse to believe it. These deaths were slaughter, the causes of which it is our pressing duty to isolate, study, and remove. Add to these distinguished dead the names of the hundreds of thousands of obscure men and women violently killed, and it is obvious that we are facing here a problem of major magnitude.

If any one person dead in 1935 is destined to immortality, we think it is Jane Addams. Sainted in her own lifetime, the founder of Hull House has already been received into the enduring tradition of the race. Second only to Miss Addams in this regard is Col. Alfred Dreyfus, whose death at last dropped the curtain upon the great drama of his trial. It is the case which will live here rather than the man, but this means that the man himself, or at least his name, must forever be remembered. A similar remembrance will probably be accorded by posterity to Admiral Lord Jellicoe, who commanded the great English fleet at the battle of Jutland. This battle was the greatest single naval conflict in all history, and will be discussed as long as men's minds have interest in military affairs. The entombment of the Admiral in St. Paul's, in the crypt with Nelson, is symbolical of what we mean. One other of those dead during this past year is sure of immortality, at least in his own world, and that is Hugo de Vries, the great biologist. The general public knew little of this man during his lifetime, and will know still less now that he is gone. But the tale of science can never be told without mention of his name and description of his work. In that glorious cluster of names which groups itself about the name of Charles Darwin, like planets around a central sun—Wallace, Huxley, Spencer, Lyell, Hooker, Haeckel, Weissmann, Mendell, Romanes—de Vries must always have its well-earned place. Of the other dead this past twelve-month, how many will be remembered, or are remembered now? Not many! Yet are there not a few whose deeds are precious in their varied way? We would recall these who were important, at least in their own day, if only that gratitude may do its perfect work in our own hearts.

In the field of literature, two names stand especially conspicuous among the dead—Sir William Watson, the English poet, and Edwin Arlington Robinson, the American. Certain of Watson's writings have entered into the permanent treasury of English verse, notably his song of April and his elegies on Wordsworth and Tennyson. Of Robinson's poems, we believe the Arthurian narratives will survive, and a number of the lyrics and sonnets. Along with these must be named Geo. E. Russell ("A. E."), the Irish poet, and our own American, Lizette Woodworth Reese, whose sonnet, "Tears," is certain of immortality. Among other well-known writers who passed away are the English novelist, J. R. Fletcher; and, here at home, Thomas Boyd, novelist; Anne Douglas Sedgwick, novelist; Holman Day, the Maine story-teller; Anna Katherine Green, famous author of detective stories; Arthur S. Roche, novelist; Mrs. Kate Upson Clarke and Mrs. Wilson Woodrow, two writers of popular fiction; Nathan Haskell Dole, editor, scholar, and translator of Tolstoi; Charles De Kay, poet and critic; and Oliver Herford, accomplished wit and light versifier. In France there disappeared a great figure in Henri Barbusse, author of *Le Feu*. A great English publisher died in Thomas Fisher Unwin, and a great German publisher in Hans Ullstein. Buyers of first editions and fine books mourned Benjamin D. Maggs, the London bookseller. Akin to authors and publishers, in the literary field, are journalists. Many distinguished newspaper names appear on the 1935 roll. Among these are Adolph Ochs, of the New York *Times*, and his able business manager, Louis Wiley. The London *Times* said farewell to one of its great editors, George E. Buckle. A gallant and heroic figure was Fremont Older, who made history in California. The death of James Heaton brought to mind the tragedy of the New York *World*, with which he was so long and honorably identified. Herman Bernstein was an able Jewish journalist. Joseph Edgar Chamberlain and Arthur Ruhl and Gilson Gardiner were notable.

In the world of music, we note the passing of a number of eminent composers—chief among these, the famous Paul A. Dukas, of France. Others include the Englishmen, Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie, Sir Fredrick Cowan, and Isidore de Lara. England can ill afford to lose such musicians. Here in America we lost one of the great modern composers, Charles Martin Loeffler; also, the composer of delightful light operas, Alfred J. Robyn. Long to be remembered is that incomparable singer and great woman, Marcella Sembrich. Another fine singer was Herbert Witherspoon, who died so tragically on the eve of his assumption of the directorship of the Metropolitan Opera House. In the neighboring realm of art, painting, sculpture, and architecture—the dead include Max Liebermann, a famous German painter; Joseph Farquharson, an English landscape painter; and C. H. Niehaus and Henry Augustus Lukeman, American sculptors. Childe Hassam was a most accomplished artist, and so, also, in her field of child life, was Jessie Wilcox Smith. "Zim," the *Punch* and *Judge* man, was a cartoonist, and so was the comic strip creator of "Andy Gump," Sidney Smith. Whether these two were also artists is perhaps something of a question. Along with musicians and artists may well

be named departed scientists, scholars, and educators. Here we record CHARLES RICHET, of France, MICHAEL PUPIN, the master of physics, JAMES HENRY BREASTED, renowned Egyptologist, HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN, biologist, and long director of the great Museum of Natural History in New York. We remember with especial gratitude and reverence PROFESSOR GEORGE P. BAKER, of Harvard, later of Yale, and PROFESSOR EPHRAIM EMERTON, of the Harvard Divinity School, at whose feet we sat in our youth. These were both great teachers! A notable death was that of PROFESSOR J. J. R. MCLEOD, co-discoverer of insulin. Also, MISS M. CAREY THOMAS, former President of Bryn Mawr, and JAMES HAUGHTON WOOD, long Professor of Philosophy at Harvard.

Always we quicken to the roll call of reformers. Not many of these passed on in 1935. But two great women died in the redoubtable CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN, author as well as reformer, and HARRIET M. MILLS, woman suffragist in the old days. FREDERICK ALMY was one of the gentlest and wisest of social workers, and gallant beyond measure was WILLIAM H. THOMPSON, lawyer of Boston, who fought for Sacco and Vanzetti until the last dread midnight moment. Reform leads us to religion, where we find distinguished and lovely names among the dead. FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE was a great prince of the church. BISHOP BOYD VINCENT, DR. GEORGE H. THOMAS, of Chicago, DR. WILLIAM M. GEER, of New York, and DR. JAMES O. S. HUNTINGTON, were famous Episcopalians. DR. W. CORTLAND MYERS and PASTOR W. W. BUSTARD were Baptists. DR. WILLIAM L. SULLIVAN, REV. FRED MERRIFIELD and REV. CARLYLE L. SUMMERBELL were admired leaders among the Unitarians. RABBI GABRIEL WOLF MARGOLIS was chief among all the orthodox Jewish rabbis of America. "BILLY" SUNDAY was himself the last in the great succession of evangelical revivalists. FRANK MASON NORTH was prominent in the Federal Council of Churches, and the author of one of the most famous of all modern hymns. WILLIAM H. SHORT carried his religion directly into the peace field, where he did useful work. MGR. JOHN P. CHIDWICK was long remembered as the chaplain of the ill-fated "Maine." May the church be followed by the theater? If so, we would name among actors, long admired and this past year dead—EUGENE POWERS, VINCENT SERRANO, FRANK DANIELS, FREDERICK WARDE, FRED ERIC, DE WOLFE HOPPER, FRANCIS WILSON, MOFFATT JOHNSON, ALEXANDER MOISSI, GEORGE GROSSMITH, MRS. KENDALL, and ZELDA SEARS. One of all these actors challenges special mention—namely, RICHARD B. HARRISON, the unforgettable "De Lawd" in *The Green Pastures*. One well-known playwright passed away—LANGDON E. MITCHELL, author of *The New York Idea*.

In the world of politics and statesmanship famous names were cancelled. In Russia, VALERIAN VLADIMIROVICH KUIBYSHEV, Vice-Chairman of the People's Commissars; and PETER SMIDOVITCH, Vice-President of the U. S. S. R.; in France, JULES CAMBON, ambassador; in Germany, GOTTFRIED VON JAGOW, minister; in Poland, MARSHALL PILSUDSKI, dictator; and in England, LORD EDWARD CARSON and ARTHUR HENDERSON. Here in our own country there looms at death's portals the majestic figure of JUDGE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES; also, FREDERICK H. GILLETTE, ex-Speaker of the House; FRANK H. HITCHCOCK, ex-Postmaster General; RICHARD WASHBURN CHILD, ex-Ambassador to Italy and journalist; and JEREMIAH SMITH, lawyer and League of Nations rebuilder of Hungary. To these may be added two eminent soldiers—the English FIELD MARSALL BYNG, of Vimy Ridge fame, and the Austrian FIELD MARSHAL STRAUSSENBURG. Lastly, there comes that list of dead who defy rigid classification. These include JAMES BARTON PAYNE, the Red Cross leader; GEN. A. W. GREELEY, the Arctic explorer; and MISS ANNIE E. PECK, the mountain climber; GUSTAV LINDENTHAL, bridge builder; W. W. ATTERBURY, railroad president; ALFRED DU PONT, powder manufacturer; J. N. WILLYS and ANDRÉ CITROEN, automobile manufacturers; E. L. DOHENY, of "Tea Pot Dome" fame; M. J. VAN SWERENGIN, corporation magnate and railroad speculator; WILLIAM D. GUTHRIE, lawyer; JAY GOULD and HENRY H. ROGERS, JR., scions of famous names; TED COY, Yale football player and social light; HANK O'DAY, baseball umpire; GUY NICHOLS, rowing coach; and FRANK ARDEN, Single Taxer, pacifist, and founder of the Arden community. "All these were honored in their times" in one way or another. They make a fascinating list. How varied are the men of earth, and the work they strive to do!

To Sorrow

I the earth am, and thou the plow art;
Enter, O Sorrow! into my heart.

Long am I idle, heedless of pain,
Dead to the rapture of sunshine and rain.

Fruitless, unlovely, wasted and bare.
Break me and make me of Beauty aware.

Let me be harrowed until I can see
The Wonder of Being awaken in me.

Something immortal teach me to know—
Something divine that will out of me grow.

I the earth am, and thou the plow art;
Enter, O Sorrow! into my heart.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Jottings

Earl Browder, leader of the Communist Party in this country, is a native American, born in Kansas, and brought up in the Unitarian church. We have never heard the Unitarians boast of this fact. We wonder why they do not add Browder's name to their world-famous honor roll of distinguished Americans.

Within the past few weeks a drunken mother killed her own son with a shotgun, a drunken husband threw his wife out of a twelfth-story window, a gangster murdered a newspaper editor at the feet of his wife and little daughter, a wife shot down her husband's secretary-mistress, and respectable citizens (so-called) whipped and tar-and-feathered three political rivals, one dying of his injuries. Who says this isn't a great country? What other country in all the world can match it?

Among the myriad "boondoggling" enterprises of the government, there seems definitely to be no place for a census of the unemployed. We imagine that such a census would prove embarrassing, in the presidential election year, to an administration which has abolished unemployment!

New York residents are going into Connecticut to buy their liquor, in order to escape the New York tax. New York officials are arresting automobilists crossing the state line with "booze." But since the "booze" is in the automobile and not in the automobilist, why worry?

Premier Baldwin saved his office but not his reputation in sacrificing Sir Samuel Hoare to the diplomatic crime of which he himself was guilty. He now sits worthily at the head of a cabinet which holds the traitor, J. Ramsay MacDonald, in its midst.

Some years ago England, France and Germany were represented in foreign relations by Cecil, Briand, and Stressemann. Now they are represented by Baldwin, Laval, and Hitler. Thus does the European scene grow steadily worse! J. H. H.

Prejudice: An Instinct, a Conditioning, or a Purpose?

Prejudice is a growing menace throughout the world today, as evidenced by the increasing use of violent and distorted propaganda. Wherever the social and economic system is in a critical condition, constant appeal is made to popular prejudice;—on the one side to hold together the tottering structure, or on the other side to create a new order.

In view of this increasing danger it well behooves us to understand the nature of prejudice, and to ask ourselves the fundamental questions: Is it an instinct, a conditioning, or a purpose?

First, regarding instinct. There seems to be little or no evidence for the hypothesis of an instinctive prejudice if we consider the subject in its entirety. Instincts in order to conform to the accepted definition must be (a) few in number, (b) consistent in the individual, and (c) universal throughout space.

Even a superficial glance at prejudice shows an almost infinite number and variety.

To name only a few of the outstanding examples, we have the following prejudices: Food, such as the unwillingness of many people to even taste what is popular in another part of the world, as raw fish. The attitude toward women differs widely, for in some cultures woman is given great freedom and is considered an equal with man, while in other cultures she is tremendously handicapped and her activities are sharply curtailed. Another instance is race, for whites gladly marry Negroes in some parts of the world, while they despise Negroes in other geographical sections. In economics, a capitalist may be considered the acme of perfection in America, while he is thought of as a devil in Russia. In one state, science and the scientist have tremendous prestige. In a neighboring state, among a different class of people, everything scientific is taboo. The attitude toward inventions differs as widely as temperaments. In the West we rush the building of railroads, automobiles and airplanes, whereas in some Oriental countries the popular mind resists such mechanical innovations as being sacrilegious and detrimental. Even in the case of scientists, we have prejudices, for, while Pasteur was proving the germ theory, many of his peers were fighting it, although Lister was demonstrating the reality of it in his successful surgical operations. The fact of variety, therefore, would seem to throw out a serious consideration of instinct.

Next, the individual changes his biases over a period of time. He may come to love what he hated, or he may hate what he loved. The attitudes and feelings which he may have at ten years of age may disappear, and a new complex appear when he is twenty-five. So on at different stages,—the mental furniture of an individual at forty years of age will be different from that of the same person at seventy-five. This indubitable fact would seem to throw out any plea for an instinctive basis of prejudice as such, for instincts should be consistent in the individual.

Again, our biases and preconceptions differ over space, for we find that attitudes vary from Occident to Orient, from North to South, and from one culture group to another. Our patterns of violent likes and dislikes are quite largely geographical and are so fundamentally different that no careful scholar would class them as belonging to a unified instinct.

The question is not simple, and any attempt to waive aside all instinctive drive in prejudiced behavior may not be justified, for prejudices, like all other factors of human thought and action, are extremely complex. It may be that, underlying certain forms of our biases and impulses, there are elements of innate and primal urge; but considering the two facts explained above,—namely, the difference over time and space—

it becomes wholly impossible to confine prejudice, as such, within the limits of any strictly defined or separate instinct.

It has recently been the fashion in psychology to account for mental states in terms of conditioning. Whatever we are and whatever we do are dependent largely upon the influences which have been brought to bear upon our childhood and youth. From the very first day of birth we receive impressions from parents, friends, neighbors; and, as we grow, these impressions enlarge to take in such wider circles as neighborhood, community, nation, and international culture groups. It is perfectly obvious to anyone who studies prejudice that our biases are received in early life before we have the power of rational analysis. Our attitudes toward such questions as sex, politics, race, creeds, nations and religions are all affected by a social mind which exists before the individual is born, and they are taken over by the growing child as natural and right. Nothing in sociology is more certain than that the extant mores are always assumed by the majority to be the best and the most justified. In other words the mind set of the individual toward our whole culture is a prejudgment.

Such agencies as the home are sure to impress upon the child a certain preconception favorable to the status quo. Perhaps not in all things, but most assuredly so in most things. This amply accounts for the great majority of our prejudices, making it unnecessary to fall back upon an hypothesis of instinct. Perhaps one illustration may suffice. In Lasker's volume on *Racial Attitudes Among Children*, we find this true story. A little girl was traveling with her southern mother on a railroad train, and a kind-hearted Negro porter, taking an interest in the child, asked her whether she would like a present. "Oh yes!" she exclaimed, with childish happiness. So the porter went to the back of the car, took an orange from his food supply and presented it to the youngster. She was enthusiastic in her appreciation and holding up the orange she said, "Oh look, mamma, see what the nice, nasty, dirty nigger has brought me." This true incident is pathetic in its revelation of the attitudes which children assume before they have the slightest idea as to what these attitudes mean. The very words "nasty" and "dirty" meant nothing, except that she had heard them as applied to Negroes. Later in life, when the girl becomes adolescent, these phrases will begin to bear their fruit of suspicion and dislike.

Conditioning of this kind is going on today at a tremendous rate in Russia, where young people are taught anti-religious attitudes and are shown exhibits of the most distorted sort, ridiculing the idea of God, the personality of Jesus and the whole profession of the priesthood. The mind of the child is being drilled into obedience in Japan by semi-military leaders who are constantly teaching loyalty to the empire, to the Shinto religion, and the half-god heroes of Japanese history. The same thing is going on in Germany and in Italy where the mind of man is being distorted and truth is being brutally twisted. A flock of innumerable prejudices will be hatched by these methods of conditioning and no one can adequately imagine what terrible consequences are going to be reaped in the future.

It would be a superficial view, however, to explain all prejudice merely in terms of cultural conditioning. There is something more urgent in prejudiced behavior, for it exhibits characteristics of drive and purposeful energy. If we look behind the surface of what is going on in such countries as Germany and Italy, or if we examine carefully certain movements in the United States, we shall see that prejudices perform an important function. They are not put into operation merely because they have been superimposed upon us by our home, school or state. For instance, the anti-Jewish movement in Germany serves the definite purpose of escaping competition. After the Peace Treaty, the old, proud Reich staggered and shivered at the innumerable blows of misfortune. Being surrounded by former enemies, having inflation, losing colonies, and being generally distressed, it found itself sunk into a slough of despond. How can the poor gain better wages? How can the business man reconstruct his broken business? How can the state regain its pride? One way which seemed open to certain astute minds was to rouse a bitter feeling against the Jew; for is not the Jew successful? Are there not too many Jewish lawyers, doctors and rich business men? Eliminate the Jew and it becomes possible to remove competition. Thus we have a definite prejudice worked into a fury for a definite, specific purpose.

Again, watch the tactics of a candidate for political office who is trying to beat his competitor. If he is a low type of person, he will call attention to the fact that his opponent believes in birth control and is therefore an immoral man and should have nothing to do with our lily-white American institutions. Or if he belongs to a labor union, see the candidate berate him with an attempt to overthrow the Constitution. Examples of this type are endless in number and variety. There is always a popular prejudice available for the person who wants to use it in achieving such an end as getting rich, overthrowing an enemy, winning a prize or securing the acclaim of the multitude.

It has often been said that ignorance is the mother of prejudice. Not so. If a person were completely ignorant he would have no prejudice at all. The ignorant mind may be played upon and utilized by a person, but the ignorance in and of itself does not create a bias either for or against any point of view. It may rather be said that prejudices are definitely purposeful, especially in their more harmful aspects. If the white did not fear competition from the Negro, race prejudice would largely disappear. If the capitalist did not fear the communist, propaganda of the "red" variety would be of no avail. If men did not desire to keep women in a position of subserviency, they would grant to the "weaker sex" equal privileges and opportunities.

Let us realize, therefore, that in combating prejudice we are fighting against something which on the one hand is not so deeply seated as instinct, nor yet, on the other hand, so easily changed as conditioning. The menace of prejudice lies largely in the fact that it is a purposeful drive and can always be used effectively as a weapon in the competitive struggle.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER,

Miss May Johnson, who was associated with UNITY for more than a quarter of a century, passed away in Chicago, December 23, 1935.

A suitable tribute to her long and faithful service will be published in a later issue of UNITY.

Beyond Ethics

No reminder is needed in a periodical like UNITY that the volumes and the essays written on the causes of war have been myriad. The present article will call attention to a cause of war seldom recognized as such. Everyone knows that evil often wears the mask of the good. But, that lovers of peace can unwittingly promote war and can do so in their moments of liveliest idealism, few of us have ever suspected.

The misleading use of the words "right" and "wrong" lies at the root of the trouble. "Right" and "wrong"—words excellent and indispensable in their proper setting—can work immeasurable harm when introduced into an improper setting.

One of those improper settings is that of quarrels and controversies, whether between groups or between individuals. Without exception, in every conflict, each side hotly proclaims itself right and vehemently brands the other side as wrong. Both sides are equally sincere and equally convinced that the other side is insincere. If we grant the application of the terms "right" and "wrong" to the one side, we can not, by any stretch of logic, inhibit their parallel utilization by the other side. To do so were to forsake the role of impartial observer and to assume that of partisan. But how can a word mean anything if, at one and the same time, it means opposite things? The only alternative to sanctioning the use of the identical word with one purport here, and a contradictory purport there, would be to withhold it from both contestants. But, if that were to happen, the quarrel would collapse. Talk about right and wrong is the life breath of every strife. When argument about right and wrong terminates, the fight has to terminate. The words "right" and "wrong" are, in those connections, not expressions of thought but adjournments of thought. It is into the vacuum left by deserting thought that the cyclones of contention surge.

Not only when we quarrel, but every time we rebuke some one, we resort to that fatal vogue. All censure is, in fact, a species of controversy. Whenever we scold, we attach to the words "right" and "wrong" an import the very opposite of that entertained by our culprit. Moreover, as often as we berate some one, we play the part of plaintiff and, simultaneously, that of judge. Does that offer much guarantee of justice? How well deserved is the glory adorning the adage, "Judge not"! Loyalty to the ways of peace would require unqualified obedience to that bidding. War is merely disparagement writ large. Our deprecations of people correspond to the tiny film in the projector; war is the immense picture on the screen. "Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca or . . . thou fool" is literally an abetter of Mars.

We shrink from the notion that might makes right; and, yet, every censure conceals a prepossession that might makes right. All denunciation enfolds a feeling, however obscure, that some vaguely conceived social support is on the side of the denouncer. Sometimes reference to that support becomes explicit: "You will be run out of town." "The people will repudiate him." "Folks will not stand for that." "Every sensible person will say I am right." "The future will show." Sumner blurts out brutally: "Nothing but might has ever made right and, if we include in might (as we ought to) elections and decisions of courts, nothing but might makes right now." This remark, unwelcome though we may find it, articulates an assumption which lurks in the background of every reproach. Censure is not only an infliction of pain and thus an application of force; tacitly and half consciously, if not openly, it summons an entire armory of social force. The wish to coerce is father to the thought of coercion by social allies.

But, in the distortionate usages of "right" and "wrong" that censuring, quarreling and war-making have in common, more is involved. All strife lives on ignorance. When people learn the facts about one another, they cease to see reasons for strife. The record of every war in history has shown that wars are fought over "things that are not so." War and propaganda are proverbially inseparable, and propaganda is but another word for deception. The same applies to clashes between individuals. When truth emerges, conflict ends. Conciliation follows explanation. Similarly, as we find out more about people, we stop blaming those people. "To comprehend all is to pardon all." Would the scoldings which we have ourselves undergone have been visited upon us had our scolders understood just why we acted as we did? The matters for which we are reprimanded are sometimes, perhaps often, matters in which we actually had no choice. Spinoza observes that when we have traced the causes of events, we are no longer irritated by those events. Entire sciences such as child guidance, psychiatry, and modernized penology have been reared on these discernments. Our law courts at least recognize insanity as a mitigating factor, even though they may refuse to accord similar weight to causes other than those labeled "insanity." Ignorance, then, of why people act as they do is also a feature common to scoldings, altercations and wars.

A cognate species of ignorance is our practice, when aroused, of uttering prognostications. "If Germany wins the war, democracy will die." "Spare the rod and spoil the child." "Nothing good ever comes of a person who smokes." "A girl who goes on the stage is headed for ruin." "Parole will increase crime." "The study of science will lead to godlessness." Granting that such predictions are true, what proof can we furnish that they are true? How do we know that they are true? If knowing when we do not know is the crown of knowledge—Socrates is quoted to that effect—then failure to know when we do not know is ignorance unmistakable. Once more a wish, a vindictive wish, begets a thought, the thought of punitive disaster upon our offenders. The appeal to force wears a disguise here which is well-nigh transparent.

When some one's conduct wounds us, all that we know for certain is that we are pained. The causes or motives of the deed, not to mention the future consequences of the deed, are points of conjecture and, considering the conjecturer's perturbed state of mind, an inordinately precarious conjecture.

There is an additional type of ignorance common to wars, condemnations and altercations. What would we say of a janitor who, seeking to cool a room, turns on the steam or, intending to warm the room, shuts off the steam and opens the windows to the wintry blasts? We would, to put it mildly, surmise that the means adopted were unsuited to the ends desired. That same maladaptation characterizes war. Men go to war for the purpose of national defense. But war defends no one. War is not national defense. War is national exposure. War renders the enemy not less disposed but more disposed to harm us. Similarly with personal disputes. We wrangle with people in order to bring

them into compliance with our desires, when our very antagonism can make them only more eager to resist our desires. We denounce, condemn and rebuke, presumably that people might desist from contravening our wishes. Yet what is there like denouncing, condemning and rebuking that enflames people with a zeal for thwarting our wishes?

When the measures to which we resort are flagrantly at variance with the ends which we profess, the suspicion is in place that the professed ends are not the same as the real ends. Psychologists draw the distinction between our conscious wants and our unconscious wants. We can think we want something when, in reality, we want something else. National defense, though the avowed purpose of war, need not be the real purpose. The protection of one's person, property or privileges, though the ostensible purpose, need not be the real purpose of personal collision. The moral improvement of some one need not be the real object of the upbraidings which claim such object. If we are to credit the latest psychological pronouncements, deep down below the conscious mind, the unconscious mind harbors cravings for domination, revenge and display—which may account more adequately for our militancy than the stately motives publicly alleged. No wonder that "Know thyself" ranks among the world's deathless admonitions. Ignorance of self must be added to those other types of ignorance common to wars, quarrels and excoriations.

We are now prepared to notice how the words "right" and "wrong" can be employed to advantage. "Right" and "wrong" are helpful when they hold in view a clearly defined purpose and a wish to affirm or deny the serviceability of certain expedients for achieving that purpose. From Indiana, it is right to go east if one aspires to reach Pittsburgh. It is wrong to go east if Kansas is the destination. It is right to say "five" when the sum sought is that of two and three. It is wrong to say "five" when the sum is that of four and three. It is right to reach for a needle if one's aim is to sew. It is wrong to take a needle if one's task is digging a ditch. The blunder which feeds quarrels and invectives as well as wars is the blunder of construing, in an absolute sense, words which are valid only in a relative sense. It is as though the people of Tokyo, declaring that New York is far, were to execrate the people of Brooklyn who, just as vigorously, insist that New York is near. Anything which is wrong with regard to one purpose may, at the very same time, be right with regard to a different purpose.

That is why this paper is entitled, "Beyond Ethics." "Ethics" is a beautiful word but, with it, we mask that perilous thing, the absolutistic use of "right" and "wrong." Were that error banished from human life, the likelihood of war would be banished.

Beyond ethics, that is, beyond the ill-defined use of "right" and "wrong," shines a realm to which religion has often soared. We have already cited "Judge not" and "Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca." We might add expressions like these: "Bear no grudge, take no revenge." "Love covereth all transgressions." "Blessed are the merciful." "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you." "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." "God maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain to the just and the unjust." "Forgive seventy times seven." The Jewish teachers have urged: "Judge not thy fellowman until thou standest in his place." "Look not on any man with disdain." "Be respect for another precious unto thee as respect for thyself." "Better to be persecuted than persecutor." "Who is a hero? He who subjugates himself. Who is the supreme hero? He who transmutes a foe into a friend." Whittier pleads:

> "That man is holier than a creed, that all
> Restraint upon him must consult his good."

Equally antithetic to the spirit of quarrels, vituperations and wars is the spirit of science with its observing, testing, experimenting, measuring. Science rigidly discriminates between things guessed at and things proved. Science shies from facile and impulsive predictions. Science defines its objectives. There is always a specific distance to be measured, a specific substance to be analyzed, a specific problem to be solved, a specific question to be answered. Measuring in general, analyzing in general, solving in general, answering in general do not occur within the scientific domain. Religion has long been supposed to view ethics as its friend and science as its foe. Perhaps the alignment should be reversed, science its friend and ethics its foe —at least ethics in the sense of censorious attitudes buttressed by an indeterminate use of the words "right" and "wrong."

Those who would advance the reign of peace will be wary about those words as well as about assigning motives to human conduct, about foretelling the consequences of human conduct and, above all, about the hidden aggressiveness of their own hearts. They will forbear to stress the difference between "virtuous" and "wicked"; the distinction they will substitute will be that between problems and their solutions, ills and their remedies, pain and its abatement. They will never, under any pretext, intentionally inflict pain in any form where such can, by any possibility, be avoided. The force of circumstances, that inevasible force, will be the only force in which they will take part as agents. Even that force will operate amid their fathomless regret and their untiring alertness to discover a merciful alternative.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH.

The Magi's Star

Nineteen hundred years have passed,
Nineteen hundred and a score,
Since the Magi saw the star
Of Good Will Forevermore.

Still the world is filled with wars,
And the diplomats agree
To play on the ancient game
With accustomed secrecy.

Still the ghastly profiteers
Think in terms of oil and coal,
Bartering the people's blood
In the game of world control.

Still the nations of the earth
Counsel, plan and legislate,
By an outworn pagan creed
In the terms of fear and hate.

Still the statesman who would dare
To apply the golden rule
To all nations of the earth
Seems a dreamer and a fool.

Still we sing the song of peace,
Glorify the Magi's star,
While we pander to man's hate—
Sow the seed of endless war!

JOHN G. BAXTER.

Fascistic Legislation Faces Congress

A movement grown beyond mere agitation is now seeking, by means of fascistic legislation, to curb the constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press. The proponents of such measures as the Tydings-McCormack military disaffection bill are the same individuals and organizations who cry loudest about their constitutional prerogatives in other directions. It is revealing to know that 100 per cent American groups, such as our naval establishment, the American Legion, and the D.A.R., are behind this movement. In launching this attack on American liberties, the foregoing agencies, together with other patrioteers, are aided by the "free" press of William Randolph Hearst.

The object behind the fascistic drive in Congress is to prevent criticism regarding certain American institutions, especially the army and the navy. This attack on fundamental liberty ignores the fact that free speech and free press are the bed-rock of the American system.

A short resume of the history of the disaffection measure is illuminating. It was introduced in the Senate on May 14 by Senator Tydings (D., Md.) and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Previously, a similar bill had been introduced into the House by Congressman McCormack (D., Mass.). This bill was allowed to rest and the Senate bill was considered in its stead. The Senate bill was reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee on May 24 by Mr. Tydings, himself a member of the committee. Thus, its sponsors from the very beginning were instrumental in choosing the easiest path for favorable Senate action on the bill by having it considered by a committee in which the author had more influence. At the time the bill was introduced, it provided that "whoever advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, including the reserves . . . to disobey the laws or regulations governing such forces . . . or whoever publishes or distributes any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing which advises," etc., "shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both."

The second section of the bill provided that any of the writing described in the first section might be seized from any place or person under a search warrant in accordance with the provisions of the war-time espionage act.

On June 24 the bill in this form was passed by the Senate. There was no record vote, no dissenting voice, indeed, no question as to the purpose of the legislation. The bill was passed on the unanimous consent calendar, which allows a bill to be hastily considered, out of turn, and unless there is an objection by some member, no roll call is taken. On the day in question, there was no objection. As a matter of fact, a careful reading of the Congressional Record reveals no evidence that the vast majority of the Senators even knew the subject matter of the bill being considered. Any real conception of the ramifications of such a bill was even further from their minds.

On June 27, the bill was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee for action. On July 22 it was reported to the House, with two committee members, Congressmen Maverick (D., Tex.) and Kvale (F.-L., Minn.) in disagreement. The measure was now changed to protect only the army of the United States from subversive influence. This new phrasing was a sop to organized labor after it had indicated unyielding opposition to the principle of the bill. Labor was against the bill because of the possibility of the National Guard using the act to break up strikes by jailing strikers who might protest establishment of martial law. Although the National Guard was not mentioned in the new wording, the army did not announce any change in its existing policy of considering the guard a part of the army. Another new phrase, ". . . whoever with the intent to incite disaffection," was also introduced. The purpose of this phrase was supposedly to limit the effect of the bill to those who deliberately aimed at causing disloyalty. This was the Committee's answer to the criticism that its application would extend to any civilian criticism of the armed forces.

The reporting of the bill necessarily placed the measure on the House calendar. Through the alertness of opponents of the bill, passage of the measure was blocked during the remaining days of the session. Congressional practice allows the bill to retain its privileged status. Thus it is still on the calendar, ready to be acted on by the House at any time during the coming session.

The proponents of this law claim that present law is inadequate to protect the membership of our armed forces from communistic influence. Free speech and free press, according to the majority report, are not to be curbed; but those persons would be punished who advocate disobedience directly by word of mouth or by publishing and distributing material which advocates disobedience. To do this they feel that stringent legislation is needed.

Opponents of the bill, led by Maverick and Kvale in their minority report, are extremely caustic about the need for the measure, its application, its infringement of constitutional rights, and the basic philosophy. They point out that the measure smacks of the fascistic and communistic dictatorship, and that it is the first of its kind to be put forward in peace time in our national legislature.

Specifically, in the words of the minority report of the House Committee, it violates the first and fourth amendments of the Constitution, which guarantee free speech and immunity of persons and property from search and seizure. The dissenting report states that there is no likelihood of mutiny, sedition, or revolution in the army or navy, in spite of alleged evidence of communistic infiltration. Further, communistic propagandizing in the armed force has not been effective, according to sworn testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt and Brigadier General Alfred T. Smith of the War Department, General Staff. Opponents of the bill further maintain that the measure is an insult to the loyalty of the enlisted men and a reflection on the ability and efficiency of the officer personnel. The bill, they claim, is directly aimed at suppressing organized labor by preventing any criticism of the use of National Guard forces in strike situations.

As to the need of such legislation, at the present time, those opposing the bill, supported by competent

legal testimony made to the House Committee, show that the present law amply covers the activities which the legislation is aimed at. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., well-known professor of law at Harvard, maintains that the "proposed bill is not only unnecessary, but is likely to be used in times of excitement to suppress discussion among civilians." He further states that its terms do not, of course, indicate such a result, "but the words of such a statute come, in practice, to mean much more than is apparent when they are first read." That such an interpretation is likely, may be deduced from war-time practices which are fully covered in the minority report. In cases brought to trial under the espionage act during the last war, no evidence had to be given that any member of the army and navy was directly touched by speech or printed matter of those convicted under the terms of the act. No assurance is contained in the wording of the disaffection act that any different result can be expected in peace-time use of this legislation. Further support of the belief that it will be so used comes from the fact that the change made in substituting the words "the army and navy" for "the naval and military forces," is meaningless. To the casual observer this would seem to invalidate its application to National Guard forces, the point in which organized labor is particularly interested. At no time in recent history, however, has the National Guard been considered anything but an integral part of our military forces. Federal appropriations support in large part the National Guard, and the President has during the last session of Congress been given the right to assign officers of the Guard to any State in the Union in event of an emergency. Thus, while labor is placated by a misleading phrase, it is not protected against the provisions of the act, if it protests the use of the militia in time of strikes.

Representative Maverick sees the real reason for the bill as an effort to stop people from criticizing the size of the appropriations for the army and navy. This intention was stated in the testimony of General Amos A. Fries, U. S. A., retired, before a sub-committee of the House Military Affairs Committee. Since General Fries has busied himself in helping to sponsor this bill and analogous measures, such as prohibiting the teaching of the facts of communism in the public schools, and bills requiring loyalty oaths from public school teachers, it is well to take note of his testimony. Particularly, the minority report draws attention to the fact that any criticism which is printed in a newspaper or periodical, however vague it might be, would, if it questioned the conduct or efficiency of the army or navy, be liable to the application of the act.

There is an excellent chance that this bill will be defeated in the House. It can only pass if the interested public remains quiet. In a campaign year, President Roosevelt will have no liking for such a measure. But if it appears on his desk without the forceful opposition of aroused individuals and the press, pressure of the groups supporting it will obtain its passage.

This issue is the forerunner of a full dinner pail of similar legislation which is being promoted to insure semi-dictatorial control by the army and navy and so-called patriots over national policies and national affairs. Every Congressman must be made aware of the dangers of the bill, and of opposition to the measure among his constituents. Every newspaper that is published should have its attention drawn to the potential threat to a free press contained in the wording of the bill. A full and sweeping campaign should be inaugurated immediately to block any such legislation in our national legislature.

The recent rapid development of another type of fascistic legislation is shown in the enactment of various teachers' oath measures. The bills are aimed directly at the teachers, especially college professors, who are suspected of sympathy with liberal trends in government. To insure the unquestioning loyalty of the teachers, patrioteers seek to pass laws requiring the individual teachers to subscribe to a statement that they will uphold and support the Constitution and the law of the United States and of their own State. Such legislation has been vigorously, and in many cases successfully, pushed in State legislatures during 1935.

On the face of things this would seem to be a reasonable request to make of those who teach the young. However, there are serious questions which arise in the application of this measure which are not apparent on the surface. Particularly alarming is the possibility of the curbing of free discussion of national and world affairs.

Such measures as that enacted in the District of Columbia, which prohibits giving any information in regard to communism, clearly indicate the trend which is being taken by the patriots who support such measures to prevent communism. This law, aggressively supported in the nation's capital, blocks any mention of present-day Russia in the public schools. To the patriots, just as in the case of the military disaffection bill, criticism of things as they are is regarded as tantamount to communism. Democracy is thus hamstrung, and consequently a fascistic educational system is apparent.

By such laws as the military disaffection bill, criticism of the army and navy oligarchy would be banned. By legislation already enacted, teachers' oath bills, and similar legislation applying to our educational systems, freedom of thought and conscience would be supplanted by rigid restrictions prohibiting any spirit of inquiry on the part of the younger generation. One hundred per cent Americanism, as indicated in these trends, finds its kin in the concept of fascism and communism as expressed in Italy, Germany, and Russia.

Clearly, this legislation, instead of preserving the American system, destroys it; and it is high time for protest. In the words of Senator Borah, "to oppose communism and fascism by surrendering the very things, such as free speech and right of assembly, which distinguish Americanism from communism and fascism, is blundering leadership and unworthy of the support of true Americans." Too often legislation of this sort is passed because the great majority of American citizens are unaware of its real nature or its consideration either in State or national legislatures.

American citizens should awake to the fact that constitutional liberties are being taken away from them almost every time a legislature meets, if no protest is made against such bills. There is still time to halt the progress of this insidious legislation. It will only be halted by an overwhelming response on the part of individual voters who demand of their elected representatives the defeat of such tyrannical legislation. The price of liberty continues to be eternal vigilance.

JESSE M. MACKNIGHT.

The Menace of Righteousness

If John the Baptist were confronting modern men what would he tell them to do with their righteousness? If John the Revelator were to appear in contemporary society might he inform us that the Holy City is hovering in mid air because it can find no resting place among men so very righteous as some of us are? If Paul the Apostle were again to rise up in the midst of some Mars' Hill would he become trumpet-tongued in behalf of an "unknown righteousness"?

History warns us righteousness keeps the Sabbath and brands as an act of sin the opening of blind eyes on that day. Righteousness guards the temple and crucifies him who cleanses the temple. On various occasions down through the Christian ages righteousness strips for action; and Moslems, heretics, Jews, dissenters, Negroes, Indians have reason to know what happens then. War is hell, but *our* war is always righteous. War fever, mob fury are largely righteousness running a temperature. The World War was a horror of great righteousness. A complete litany might reverently include:

From ourselves and from one another, demon-possessed with our own sense of righteousness,

Good Lord, deliver us.

There is a ready retort: why caricature a perfect and indispensable ideal, why ignore its many gracious and sincere practices, by talking about its occasional perversions? Equally available is the counter retort: if the concept of righteousness persistently lapses into caricature, if, in caricature, it assumes to be the reality into whose image and likeness everything must grow, we have no choice but to scrutinize. Confessedly, such analysis does not cover a total situation either potential or actual. But an honest look even at distortion has wholesome possibilities. Its bearing may be no less wholesome if now and again bits of one's own likeness are discerned in the composite portrait.

Mr. Righteous-Man-Looking-for-Horrible-Examples is undeniably a portent and prodigy of the time. One urge of his practical approach is the conviction that we are slipping as regards the time-honored and old-fashioned integrities and simplicities. Maybe we are. (Mussolini and Hitler are among those who think so.) Anyway, it is instructive to note from what particular fields the horrible examples are taken. For instance, our man of righteousness looks at the pending child labor amendment and pronounces it not very good. I have heard him say so at legislative committee hearings. Religious leaders (not altogether confined to Roman Catholic groups) and some prominent educators have labored at great length to convict of sin even eminent churchmen who sponsor a measure so deadly to morals, religion, and habits of youthful industry as the amendment is claimed to be.

Righteousness in close formation takes a long while to pass certain given points in our present social disaster. Comment goes unmistakably moral in discussing the assumed willingness of people to "sit back and take" indefinitely and forever what is doled out in the way of welfare pittances, food allowances, clothing allotments, etc. It is so painfully suggestive of the something-for-nothing-the-world-owes-me-a-living philosophy. So the mourners go about the streets, deploring, condoling, standing aghast, at the dreadful lapse from the Declaration of Independence to the deterioration of independence. Some time ago I was interested to see an alleged-to-be-returning "prosperity" occupying temporary headquarters in the headlines of an Eastern daily of unusually high journalistic standards. Not the least significant part of the set-up was a subsidiary headline which functioned as a sounding board for the inquiry of whether the workers had "deteriorated" by reason of their long vacation.

The instances just given are fairly typical of a righteousness which applies worthwhile principles in an ominously circumscribed and superficial way. Emerson once said, "Our books are false by being fragmentary." The dictum lends itself to the paraphrase that today we have on our hands a righteousness which is dangerous by being fragmentary. The hottest moral indignation against the something-for-nothing attitude of which needy persons are accused would perhaps become seven times heated at the suggestion that its own reaction time is a bit slow. Certain it is that the typical shouter against something-for-nothing has controlled his emotions remarkably in the presence of an age-long social and economic order which legitimizes unearned income, Yes, hapless people do stand in line to receive. But, social groups whose leisure and plenty are derived from no active effort of their own exhibit themselves and their pleasurable doings all over the rotogravure sections of our Sunday papers. "Why so hot, little man," at the alleged implications of the one, and so calm in your view of the other?

Would our high-minded daily, worried about the deterioration of the workers, be willing to broaden its inquiry? It would not be surprising if workers have deteriorated on joblessness and the dole. A pinched existence, "unearned," may be bad for the morale. But are there dangers to morale in other quarters? For a considerable number of people the recognized, normal workings of our present system allow fulness of creature comforts, the best of educational and cultural advantages, wide opportunities of travel and refined association, the opening of doors for all manner of personal preferences, and all of these available without the necessity of gainful effort on the part of the recipients. Is there any liability to "deterioration" here? Considerable, one might say. Not because of the abundant living as such. But deterioration, subtle and atmospheric, is possible for these privileged ones at their most prosperous estate, to the extent that they feel no uneasiness at the disproportion of economic status; to the extent that they hide themselves from the known fact that such disproportion is needless in the productive potentialities of the modern world; to the extent that they fail to enlist actively in the task of reorganizing society in a way to universalize abundance. Deterioration? Whose?

If our intense (but sometimes one-eyed) righteousness would reason broadly from some of its own assumed premises, it might see that the unabashed takers of something-for-nothing in the relief line are guilty of nothing more than a grave

social blunder. Undoubtedly they can be censured for bad form in neglecting the documentary relationships which give substance to assertion, which indeed make unnecessary the assertion that the world owes one a living. The legal possession of pieces of paper, "earned," inherited, or received as a gift (possession is the determining thing) makes vulgar demand superfluous. Maybe "the world" as such owes nothing to anybody. But strategic areas of the world known as steel mills, railways, textile mills, oil wells, munition factories, utility corporations, copper mines, plantations of coffee, rubber, sugar, indigo, etc., will do their best for all who come with clear credentials. Paper is power, and conventional righteousness does not challenge its supremacy.

The needy do sit back and take. I know. I have seen it in action. I have in mind a clothing commissary in the dusty third story of a partly disused public building. On days of distribution to those rated as eligible for the hand-out, I have seen people gather in great numbers, at a very early hour, and mass themselves at the street entrance. All ages helped to make up the throngs,—men and women, young boys and girls, even some small children. There were Italians, Portuguese, Irish, Negroes, Greeks, Armenians, Anglo-Saxons. And here is the typical scene as I witnessed it time after time: as the door at the street level is unlocked, in surges the crowd. It stampedes up the two flights of stairs and along the corridors of the third story, people all but leapfrogging over one another in frantic hurry to be near the head of the line. Once formed, the line moves slowly through the distributing room, shuffling along inch by inch. All this, presumably, is what is meant by "sitting back."

And the "taking"? That, too, is interesting. The supply of clothing, though of good quality, is invariably limited. That fact undoubtedly gives incentive to the initial scramble and rush I have described. In fairness to the whole number, no one family can get more than a fractional part of what it asks for. With whatever effort to serve all justly, a terribly depleted supply awaits the later ones in line. The distributors tend to fall into a verbal formula, "We're very sorry, but we can't give out what we don't have."

Facing those sweltering, dishevelled human beings, I catch my mind working in comparative terms. I think of customary assumptions current in organized religious circles, sometimes voiced through regular religious channels and ministrations, as each summer time gets under way,—assumptions that "everybody" will now be relaxing in the coolness of the woods or the shore. Breath of the mountains and the sea, you are needed in this August swelter, in these grimy corridors, in all this human push and struggle. And you, observing Righteousness, score a point in noting that these desperate, driven poor are not always polite, either to one another, or even to the dispensers of benefits. "Deterioration," truly, when the destitute forget their manners! (Politeness and poise, I infer, never fail on the floor of the Stock Exchange, or even at the bridge table.)

On more than one of these occasions at the commissary there come to mind observations made in my hearing a good while before: "We don't need a change of economic system. Anyway, that isn't the job of the church. After all, don't we enjoy some fine things under our present system? For instance, there's Filene's basement. It's the coolest place in Boston in the summer time." I must be very unrighteous. Else, my conscience would pain me more in that I do not pass on to those hot suffering people the good news that Filene's basement is the coolest place in Boston in the summer time!

The concrete human situation at the clothing commissary is but a tiny salient of a total situation on which social intelligence has inscribed the laconic word "needless." Poverty is an anachronism in the modern world. So are the economic fear and worry which have served as quack incentives for what we are pleased to call "work." Broadly speaking, we have never known work in its constructive, decent sense. But true work, work more abundant, transfigured by incentives that our heathen hearts have never glimpsed,—that is our promised land, if we but choose to advance. Would that our accredited righteousness were more sure that such a consummation would even be "right." Alas, it is even now perturbed at possible effects on "character" of measures designed to do "everything" for people.

Apparently the "everything" in this ideology means things economic and material. Does this emphasis reveal the intellectual and spiritual poverty of much that passes for righteousness? Strictly construed it means that the only character-forming risks we can take are economic risks. The only struggle that builds spiritual bone and muscle is the savage struggle for a "living" in the economic cockpit. That being eliminated nothing would be left for our manhood to work upon, strive for, or grow into. In one word, Man is Economics! (Marx's own comment on such ultra-Marxism would be worth hearing.)

Nothing that even claims to be righteous in a religious sense would admit quite such a conclusion. Yet the distance that current piety has travelled with such a logic is suggested by Charles A. Beard in a powerful passage in *The Open Door at Home*. It is pointed out that cumulative influences of three hundred years of our western civilization have established salesmanship for profit as the distinctive function of the most fiercely competitive economic arena that history has ever known. The point made is that the concept of salesmanship has refused to stay put. Like an atmosphere it has pervaded every phase of political, educational, and cultural ideology. The analysis climaxes in the blistering comment, "So far has this habit gone that some who call themselves Christians are brazen enough to speak of 'selling' the religion of Jesus to the multitude."

Piety radiating the frantic heats of the marketplace; righteousness moralizing rather than interpreting; religion invoking ancestral virtue in ways that imply more honor to the adjective than to the timeless quality itself,—these are dangerous. They may yet have a part in setting the American scene for a skeleton dance rather than a march forward of living men. There is a righteousness that walks in its sleep, not knowing what it does. Setting out with its own kit of tools to do its own kind of repairing, it may discover too late that it has been nailing someone to a cross. EARL C. HAMILTON.

Professions on the Labor Front

The collapse of American post-war prosperity has brought about many changes in the social structure of the population. One of the most subtle, yet significant, upheavals has been the change that has come over the professional groups. Teachers, physicians and artists have gone unpaid for months on end and have been rescued from despair only through the intervention of the Federal government in the form of grants and loans to the local governing bodies. With their clientele becoming insolvent, professional people have come to realize the necessity of concerted action if they are to survive at all. In a word, there has been for the last five years a distinct trend toward the identification of the professionals with the labor group. They are finding themselves face to face with many of the same problems over which labor has fought and bled. The field of social work has just experienced such a phenomenon.

In reconsidering its decision to deprive the relief staff of seniority rights for taking part in the three-hour stoppage of work protesting personnel reductions, the Board of the Emergency Relief Bureau of New York City has acted wisely but has lost considerable prestige as an immediate result of its own short-sighted attitude. The association of workers in public relief agencies has finally outwitted the harassed board and has succeeded in putting them on the spot. Faced with the necessity of reducing administrative expense as relief clients became absorbed into the WPA program, the board met the demands of the union with the outworn tactics of intimidation and, in the storm of outside protests that followed, found it necessary to reverse itself. Round one in the fight between the board and the association has ended in a victory for this first big white-collar union.

With the WPA definitely getting under way in New York City, the case-load of the relief organization has dropped forty per cent, according to the figures of the Emergency Relief Bureau. It was decided that a reduction of staff of at least ten per cent was imperative but the announcement of this reduction was protested by the union on the ground that not only were the figures incorrect, but that the staff should be maintained in order to give the necessary, adequate attention to those clients remaining on direct relief. After giving the representatives of the association a hearing, the board announced that its earlier decision was final. When the union notified its locals to stop work as a protest, the board posted notices that those taking part would lose all seniority rights.

Nevertheless, workers in the relief offices, variously estimated from 3,500 to 7,500, stopped work from 9:30 a. m. to 1 p. m. on October 24th. The local chapter of the professional organization of social workers immediately addressed Mr. Knauth, chairman of the board, to the effect that while the chapter did not agree with many of the policies of the union, it felt that "the board's action—(placed) it in the position of denying the right of collective protest." The board finally limited its disciplinary measures to the docking of pay for the time spent away from the office, but in backing down on this issue has definitely lost ground.

The impartial observer is inclined to the opinion that regardless of the merits or demerits of the particular issue at hand, the board acted not only unwisely but illegally in threatening the loss of seniority rights. Section 582 of the penal law of the State of New York states in unmistakable terms that "the orderly and peaceable assembling or cooperation of persons employed in any calling, trade or handicraft for the purpose of obtaining an advance in the rate of wages or compensation or of maintaining such rate, is not a conspiracy." This, of course, does not provide for a case in which the strike is for the purpose of resisting a reduction in personnel but the courts* have already broadened the law to include the employment of its own members even when such a practice involves the discharge of non-members. On the other hand, Section 530 clearly points out that "a person who with a view to compel another person—to abstain from doing an act which such other person has a legal right to do—or attempts the intimidation of such person by threats or force, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

There are other issues to be considered, of course. Workers in public relief agencies are public servants, and strikes by police and fire departments have always been condemned. It is by no means settled, as yet, that the responsibilities of relief workers are not correspondingly bound up in the common welfare of the citizenry as a whole. There is likewise some question as to whether the motive adequate service to the clients does not remove the group from that body of public employees whose interrupted care might jeopardize the safety of the city. Is there a difference between a strike and a stoppage of work, or demonstration or protest?

New York state law** requires that the industrial commissioner "shall inquire into the causes of all strikes —and endeavor to effect an amicable settlement thereof." But there would probably be some doubt as to whether the association of workers in public relief agencies would come within the jurisdiction of the industrial commissioner. If faced with the demand to make such an inquiry, the commissioner might very likely seek to avoid embarrassment by denying his authority in such a case despite the "any calling, trade or handicraft" phraseology of the law. The union will probably be obliged to fight its battles by building up moral support in allied organizations and by continued demonstrations of its own power.

They feel keenly their lack of security against the possibility of arbitrary decisions of the ERB Board and they resent the attempts to rule them out now that the tremendous demand for their services is somewhat lessened by WPA. They are not forgetting that two years ago they were carrying case-loads of two and three hundred families and were obliged to give an enormous amount of overtime without additional compensation. This, despite the fact, to cite the law again, "Eight hours shall constitute a legal day's work—except in cases of extraordinary emergency"*** and "Labor shortage is not an extraordinary emergency."**** It does not, then, appear entirely unreasonable that, now that they are organized and are threatened with wholesale dismissal, they are demanding among other things:

> Average case-load of 45 as a basis for judging size of staff.
>
> All laid-off workers to have a full hearing upon request.

---

* National Protective Association, v. Cummings, 170 N. Y. 315, and Wunch v. Shankland, 179, N. Y. 545 Mem.

** Chap. 31, Art. 2, Sec. 21 Consolidated Laws as Amended.

*** Chap. 31, Art. 8, Sec. 220.

**** Letter of Attorney General, Dec. 15, 1922.

Five-day week, elimination of speed-up and overtime.

All of these things are entirely consistent with the New Deal philosophy and if the decision that the NRA is unconstitutional represents a return "to the horse and buggy days," the denial of these fundamental issues is probably equally absurd. Most of the private agencies, of course, consider a case-load of even 45 too high.

That the ERB must reduce its staff when the case-load decreases is incontestable. The refusal of the ERB board to be influenced in the least by the association was neither practical nor graceful, particularly in view of the fact that the administration leader has established his position at the head of his party by one compromise after another. In this case Mr. Knauth seems to have taken a beating. Perhaps there will be other such spectacles if business men are to continue trying to run the relief offices in "a business-like way."

FRANK DOANE.

The Study Table

A Great Book on Russia

No one who wants to understand Russia can afford to miss reading this great book.* It has a double interest, as biography and as history. Anna Louise Strong was born with the energy and vitality of twenty ordinary mortals, and with a rare outfit of brains and courage. She distinguished herself at school and college, carried on successfully various progressive and humanitarian enterprises, made a reputation as a writer, edited labor journals, and took part in Seattle's general strike. Her heart was broken by America's entrance into the World War. She knew the people wanted to keep out of it, and was sure that we were forced into it by the great moneyed interests. Eagerly desirous to visit Russia, she went to Poland to do publicity work for the Quakers' relief service there, and afterwards got leave to take a trainload of Quaker food into Russia for famine relief. Later, when the American relief under Hoover arrived, she also distributed some of that food; and she gives an illuminating account of Hoover's methods.

Her next fifteen years were spent chiefly in Russia. She did not find what she had expected:

> I had thought to find a brave new world beyond the border; I found the collapse of an old world under whose ruins men were dying. But living among these ruins were men who were building a new world from the broken pieces; there were creators in chaos. We had not allowed for the backwardness of a non-industrial country like Russia, for the Asiatic standards of vast populations, for the lack of surplus goods. Most of all, we never allowed for the ravages of intervention and blockade, of which we had no adequate conception.

She toiled to be helpful with her pen, and her work as a journalist took her all over the country. She visited Karelia—a long, thin strip of country lying between Finland and Russia, running north from Leningrad nearly 1,000 miles to the polar ocean. She decided to visit the mica mines. The President of Karelia was traveling in the same direction, and they started out together on the slow Murmansk railroad:

> We were a group of six that left the Karelian capital. I shall never forget my first night out. Six wooden bunks on which one could stretch at full length without mattress or bedding were reserved for the presidential party. Only two of these were lowers; as a woman guest I had one of them, while President Gühling took the other, not only as president but because tuberculosis in his leg-bones made movement painful. He left an eighteen-hour day of work behind him and was going to similar work; he was drooping with fatigue. Yet during the long delays at tiny stations he always got out to talk with peasants on the platforms, inquiring into local conditions and needs.
>
> In the middle of the night, peasants, finding the other cars on the train full, began to crowd into the "reserved" car. For only a few years had they known a railroad; they ignored the railroad rules. A peasant woman with a baby seated herself on the edge of Gühling's bunk and began to push against his feet. He turned in uneasy slumber and drew up his legs a little; she promptly put the baby into the vacant place. Slowly but persistently she shoved for more space, using the baby's head as a battering ram against Gühling's feet. Had she picked him as a kindly man who wouldn't hurt a baby's head even in slumber? Soon Gühling was sitting up. I told the woman that the place was reserved; she stared stolidly, unanswering. I offered to exchange with Gühling, or to rouse one of the men in the upper berths. He smiled: "Let them sleep while they can; they also have heavy work." He hunched himself painfully into half a bunk and dropped into uneasy, exhausted slumber, while I lay sleepless thinking of the difference between Gühling and other presidents I have known.

President Gühling, much beloved, was a man of wide culture, a former aristocrat. He had done and suffered much during the revolution, and had helped Karelia to repel five invasions. Since then the country has made astonishing progress.

Everywhere Miss Strong found new life beginning:

> I visited Kiev, and spoke on International Women's Day to a great throng of women—worn, intent faces under faded shawls. The women applauded, thinking me a remarkable person to have come all the way from America. But I knew that every one of those women was more remarkable than I. Every one of them had kept house through sixteen bombardments. Sixteen times in the civil war the city of Kiev changed hands. The Germans had held it, Petlura, Denikin, various guerilla bands, the Poles. . . Kiev, reviving now, was holding a big fair to get acquainted with our new industries.

Miss Strong visited the much-discussed Donetz coal mines and other mines. A group of miners from America, hearing her speak English, stopped to talk:

> They told in the twang of Illinois what they thought of Russia: "Pretty awful last year. Conditions upset by the famine. But now—well, we figure we live about as well as we did in the States. The mines aren't well organized, and it takes a week to earn what we made there in two days, but over there we couldn't count on more than two days' work a week. So it evens up. And we'd rather have it regular. It's more peaceful here."
>
> "Peaceful!" I exclaimed, remembering the civil war and famine barely over. But they gave me the workers' idea of peace:
>
> "Yep. No strikes nor lockouts. You can go to bed at night feeling sure of work in the morning, which we never could in the States. No rows with your boss at all. You've your union and your mine committee and you're insured against sickness and accident. . . But we wish this government could afford to buy good machinery. They've good intentions but no machines. But we don't want to go back. We figure in five or ten years this will be a first class country for a worker."

---

*"I Change Worlds: The Remaking of an American," by Anna Louise Strong; with a Foreword by Lincoln Steffens. Henry Holt and Company, New York. $3.00.

It was an attitude I was to meet hundreds of times in ensuing years—the typical attitude of American workers in their first experience of Soviet industry.

These were early days. Good machinery has since been introduced, and a young miner named Stakanoff has lately invented a way to increase the output of coal manyfold by having a miner who is especially expert in drilling coal devote himself wholly to that, while a group of his colleagues carry away the rubbish, shore up the timbers, and do the other necessary work. This method of increasing production by coöperation has been named Stakanovism, and an effort is being made to spread it throughout Russia. In America the anti-Russian press is representing it as an attempt to exact excessive labor from each worker.

Most interesting of all, Miss Strong visited Baku:

Oil fields in Baku! The largest field in the world. Forests of shining black derricks against every horizon. Except for these derricks, desolation. No green thing lives in Baku. The mocking blue of the Caspian is salt; Baku brought fresh water, barely enough for drinking purposes, across a hundred miles of desert. Baku was never built for happiness; it was built for the exploitation of illiterate native workers in the interests of absentee owners. The only trees in all its desert were in the Villa Petrolla, built for the chief officials of the Nobel Oil Company, but occupied at the time of my visit by four children's homes.

Here was modern industrialism on a background of primitive Asia. Workers whose dialects had hardly been reduced to writing were operating rotary oil drills fresh from America. Mohammedan women, drawing their veils across their faces and balancing heavy water-buckets across their shoulders, toiled up narrow streets under the ruins of a 1,000-year-old castle; on the plains below them a modern power plant larger than any in Europe sent current to operate eight scattered oil fields. Under my feet the rumbling of a gusher, expected hourly in Bibi Eibat field, announced its coming half a mile below the earth. Not far away was another famous gusher, delivering oil for seven years, a million barrels a year. From other derricks sounded the rattle of chains as an oil drill whirled its way through sand and gravel hundreds of feet below.

Little olive black streams of oil crept through the greasy dust of the fields, flowing towards great reservoirs. All this oil came at last to the city of Baku and its great refineries on the bay. Here were pipe lines leading to docks, and ships loading and unloading. Here stood the largest refinery in Russia, once owned by Nobel, turning out 80 different kinds of oil products, benzines, kerosenes, machine oils, paraffins. Benzine in 20 different weights poured in continuous streams of diamond white; the many-toned machine oils gleamed golden to deep brown. There were great vats of milky green "soapy" oil, followed by vats of slate-colored "washed" oil. Outside were great pools of mazut, black olive in color, waste useful for fuel.

All this wealth had once belonged to more than a hundred private companies who drained the oil from one another's fields in wasteful competition, fought and went bankrupt, in the time-honored capitalist way. The tokens of ownership were scattered in a dozen countries, as tiny slips of paper over which stock markets gambled. The workers of Baku, Russians, Turks, Armenians, Persians, never saw their owners. Not until they rose with the rest of the Russian workers, seized the fields and became owners themselves. Then race and religious wars had been fomented by the intervention; there had been massacres of Turks by Armenians and of Armenians by Turks; Baku had been seized first by German and then by British occupation, and taken once again by the oil workers. Under these struggles the fields were damaged till it seemed in 1920 that the oil of Baku might be lost forever under the floods that rose in unworked wells.

Engineers told me that Serebrovsky had saved the oil wells. He led the fight of hungry, half-clad workers and engineers against the rising waters, against fires that burned great gushers, against spying and sabotage of managers, against the attrition of blockade and famine. The lands of the hundred private companies were combined in one state owned oil trust, Azneft. The wells were organized on a rational plan, in eight chief oil fields, each with its enginering staff. Azneft bought American machinery through London, there being then no way to deal with America. Steadily production climbed. In 1923 it was double its low point of 1920. (A foot-note says that in 1934 it was eight times that of 1920.)

Then Azneft rebuilt the life of Baku's workers. Serebrovsky bought quantities of flour from North Caucasus and sent representatives into Persia to exchange oil for rice. Lacking sufficient workers, he went to Turkey and from the demoralized hordes of Wrangel's army brought back eager men who became champion workers in an effort to redeem their past. Financed by the profits of Azneft, 63 schools arose by 1923 for the oil workers' children, and 14 children's homes for the war orphans. Factory schools and night schools and an engineering university—all on the profits of Azneft.

This Serebrovsky, who "saved the oil of Baku," lived in two rooms up an iron fire-escape on an inside court. His wife was a beautiful woman, ill with tuberculosis caused by the hard conditions of Baku life. It was lack of milk and eggs that slowly starved her; it was a climate where sun beat mercilessly and wind whirled dust into the lungs.

Representatives of the trades union took Miss Strong around to some of the twenty-five libraries and thirty workers' clubs and 127 classes that were fighting illiteracy. They showed her hospitals and sanitariums and social insurance. "Serebrovsky runs engineering and production, but we organize the life of the workers," they said.

The biographical element has necessarily been slighted in this review, because of the overshadowing interest of Miss Strong's pictures of conditions in Russia. But her own life was interwoven with history, even before she left America; and she has analyzed, with singular clearness and detachment, her own mental phases and the remarkable events in which she bore a part. She tells frankly of her difficulties of adjustment in Russia, and the failure of some of her most cherished plans. Sometimes this was due, like the final collapse of the John Reed colony, to the dishonesty of a Soviet official. Among many who were working unselfishly and heroically, she found some rogues and grafters. Her troubles arose more often, however, from lack of mutual understanding than from any lack of good intent. Her most acceptable work was done with her pen. She wrote much for Hearst's International Magazine while it was edited by Norman Hapgood, and later for other papers. Sometimes on assignment, sometimes as a free lance, she visited various countries where revolutions were in progress or seemed to be impending. She gives an illuminating account of what she found in Mexico. She started the Moscow News, for English-speaking readers, but had so much trouble with one of her Russian associates on the paper that she was driven to resign. The whole difficulty was removed, however, after an interview with Stalin. He impressed her profoundly; and the impression deepens with time.

This book builds a bridge over which open-minded Americans may pass to a better understanding of Soviet Russia. Almost everything about it which has perplexed and repelled them also perplexed and repelled Miss Strong. It was fourteen years before she was ready to join the Communist party. It was Lincoln Steffens who first suggested her going to Russia. On her last visit to the United States she told him about her difficulties and trials. His comment was, "You incredibly lucky person to have the chance to help Litvinoff keep the Soviet Union out of war! It's the most important job in the whole world." She dedicates her book "To all those Americans who stand where I stood fifteen years ago, and to all those Russian Communists who want to understand America."

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Azrael Over the White House

Sinclair Lewis, creator of *Babbit, Arrowsmith,* and *Elmer Gantry,* now turns his admirable talents for grotesque towards the task of picturing an American fascist dictatorship, wherein a fictionized Huey Long, after an apocryphal election, seizes the government and embarks upon an unimagined reign of terror—through it all sounds the chill whirr of Azrael's wings, whose undulating shape, hovering above our nation's capital, slowly flings over the White House the spectral shadow of Caesarism. A tumultuous story,* in truth, this romance of a Yankee Hitler and his mortal foe, woven from page after page of sustained irony, acid innuendo, somber sarcasm; punctuated by barbs of scorching, blistering satire; beyond question, worth serious consideration, if only as a warning to Americans that the menace is not removed, that the dangers of dictatorship are more real than imaginary, and that where one man has tried to establish a nationwide despotism and failed, another may yet succeed.

Written, then, in a strange, staccato style, markedly stepped up in tempo as compared with any of his other works, Mr. Lewis' book unfolds its prophecy of an American Roman despotism—infamous, far-flung, fantastic as some Witches' Sabbath of the Blocksberg and the Brocken. Doremus Jessup, peaceful Vermont editor, watches with awed eyes that far-off shadow rising to darken the heavens, and sees it incarnated in Berzelius Windrip, Fascist colossus, Senator from Nowhere. Windrip (1936), with Sarason, his Rosenberg, supported by the unemployed, the military, Big Business, Bishop Prang and his "League of—Forgotten Men," not "the Little Flower," gains the Presidency with a most preposterous platform and a raffish campaign; and then—a frenzied, furious administration, beginning with wholesale proscriptions, followed by a military dictatorship, climaxing in a corporate state modeled on Nazi Germany, and an infuriated popular revolution led by Doremus Jessup. With the details of that revolution, space forbids us to concern ourselves. Suffice it to say that, after throttling the uprising (and, amongst other things, putting Jessup to the torture), Berzelius Windrip is overthrown through a palace revolution conducted by his Richelieu, Lee Sarason; then, after another turn of the wheel of power, the entire dictatorship collapses, leaving our journalist hero free to ride "onward all day, to a hidden cabin in the Northern woods, where quiet men awaited news of freedom.

"And still Doremus goes on in the red sunrise, for a Doremus Jessup can never die."

Thus concludes the author. "Amen!" the reader is forced to confess, after being thrilled, shocked, and mentally dislocated by Sinclair Lewis' daring repartee to *Gabriel Over the White House* (presidential dictatorship *in excelsis*): AZRAEL OVER THE WHITE HOUSE (presidential dictatorship *ad infernum*)—a fantastic outpouring rivalling Griffith's magistral *Birth of a Nation,* and soon to be filmed also; its torrential ironic prose, seething with guns, pikes, and flags, shouting armies, bestial brutality, lyric love; its nightmare reaches and its grotesque, Dickenish supporting cast—and, for its steady rhythmic motif, the awful menace of unleashed humanity, personified and epitomized in one man. A powerful novel; in fine, by far its author's greatest achievement except *Arrowsmith;* and from it Americans may well take at once an inspiration and a stern resolve, to guard their liberty with eternal vigilance, and to perish at outset rather than live on in a world where such other things can be.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*"It Can't Happen Here," by Sinclair Lewis. Doubleday Doran. $2.50.

Today—and Tomorrow!

These two books,† the one an album of drawings and the other a movie scenario, present a stern and terrible picture of our world.

Vassos has already made his reputation, as an artist of great power and imagination, in his volumes illustrating Wilde's *Salome,* Coleridge's *Kubla Khan* and Gray's *Elegy.* In two companion books, *Contempo* and *Ultimo,* he showed that he was something more than a depicter of the thoughts and dreams of other men. This modern Doré was beginning to gaze upon reality for himself, and to present with his artist's pen the thing he saw. Now, in this latest volume, in one sweeping gesture of scorching satire, he lifts an inner curtain, as it were, and shows us what we are. We are civilized, are we? We have developed culture and the humanities, have we? Well, take a look!

Twenty-four full-page drawings unroll before us in horror upon horror. Like pictures upon mighty screens, they present concepts of "Science," "Philanthropy," "The Machine," "The Church," "Nationalism," "Food," "Disarmament," "The Workers," "The Elite," "The Critics," "The Leaders," "Waste," etc., etc. The list of topics does not pretend to be complete. The artist might have gone on and done as many more drawings on as many different themes. But these are enough to convey his central idea of vast material development, accompanied by incalculable human misery, and the whole covered by a cloak of dark hypocrisy and shame. One wonders if there is no good in the world—Vassos sees none! But his whole point is that we have misused good until it has become evil, and we are consumed by the work of our own hands. Ruth Vassos' texts have neither the power nor the originality of her husband's drawings. They suffer by comparison with what is genuinely original and thus creative. But they serve a modest function of interpretation and are thus far useful.

Wells' book is a curious piece of work and reveals anew the restlessness of this great writer's mind. As though the novel were no longer adequate to his purpose, he takes the text of one of his greatest books, *The Shape of Things to Come,* and makes a story of it for the movies. The result is a scrappy, jumpy, utterly unconvincing yarn of the destruction of our world in the next war, and its reconstruction through the years by the few engineers and technicians who survive the cataclysm, and their pupils and descendants. The episodes are scandalously "episodic," the characters mere sticks of cardboard. There are curious fragments of science, sex, and satire. Curiously enough, with the vast range of the movie screen before him, Wells' imagination seems suddenly to become constricted and very bare. One can only conclude that Wells is working in a medium which is not his own. If he is tired, or grown old, he might better stop writing altogether than to turn out stuff like this. But we count this an aberration, and wait with undiminished enthusiasm for his next full-sized story. In the meantime, we return to his *The Shape of Things to Come* for another reading.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

†(1) "Humanities" by John Vassos, Text by Ruth Vassos. E. P. Dutton & Co. New York. $3.
(2) "Things to Come," by H. G. Wells. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.50.

Sermons by a Great Preacher

Readers of UNITY may not be as interested in sermons as some others we might mention. However, Harry Emerson Fosdick is a different kind of preacher from the ordinary. The present volume* is the latest in the series of volumes that will eventually publish this mighty preacher's sermons in Riverside Church during our time. That so many of them are delivered in person over "the air" should make many people want to own the book, so that they may read and re-read these live messages that have put hope these trying days into the souls of more people than one can imagine, doubtless millions in our land and elsewhere. Of course, all preachers will want this latest volume in their constant attempt to understand the secret of this preacher who towers and towers toward the zenith of preaching power among the luminaries in the homiletical world of the ages. They will not be disappointed in this latest addition to Dr. Fosdick's sermons.

These sermons are not theological, except as the only worth-while theology is based on the certain findings of psychology. They are psychological in the finest therapeutic sense. They minister to the soul of the individual and of society in these days of the birth-pains of a more endurable social order. They will give multitudes the faith and the courage to keep going through the dark night of capitalism's collapse to the new day of "production for use" for all free men and women. All twenty-five sermons tie in to the real problems of our day. If one feels the need for strength in our constant fight for peace, let him read "How Much Do We Want Peace?" Or, if one wants to know the real enemies of our American freedom, and thinks they are the Communists, let him read "How Much Do We Want Liberty?" The book is one for all true Americans to have constantly at hand. A chapter a day will keep the blues away.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

*"The Power to See It Through," by Harry Emerson Fosdick. Harper & Bros. $1.50.

Subscription Appeal

The most effective subscription appeal is that made by readers to their friends.

Each reader of UNITY is *urgently* requested to secure at least *one new subscriber* within the next thirty days.

What UNITY has meant to you it will mean to many of your friends.

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed. ☐ Send invoice.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 162)

manent recovery as long as the nation depends on palliative legislation inside the capitalistic system. The Social Security Act, however noble its purpose, nevertheless fails, in its present form, to meet our need, and places a disproportionate burden on the workers. Wages have not kept pace with rising prices, as you yourself have recently pointed out. While 60 per cent of our families have a monetary income below $2,000 per annum, and multitudes are completely destitute, the profits of great corporations have increased. We commend you for your loyal support of the Tennessee Valley Authority. True, you made an effort toward more drastic regulation of the utilities, but the compromise you accepted is utterly inadequate.

Cites Institution Report

People are being denied the bare necessities of life, while an economy of scarcity to protect the profit system is being encouraged. Studies of our potential productive capacity, reported by Loeb and his associates in "The Chart of Plenty," and by the Brooklyn Institution, reveal that a socially planned development of our natural wealth would afford an annual income of at least $4,000 to each family; and yet, under the New Deal, the disproportionate distribution of wealth and power has not been substantially changed.

We find, further, that the increasing disregard for civil liberties reveals how far we are from a just solution of our economic problems. Sound recovery would involve a closer approach to economic justice and would, therefore, remove much of the strain and tension between social classes. But now in many sections of the country the police and military are used by those in entrenched positions of power to terrorize workers who desire to organize to secure their rights. We need only cite the plight of the sharecropper under our plantation system, the intimidation of workers in numerous areas, or the sentence to the Georgia chain gang of Angelo Herndon, an innocent Negro, whose only offense was a demand for bread for hungry people.

That more than a billion dollars a year should go into armament, when a large portion of our population is in dire want and when public education languishes in many parts of the country, is evidence of a serious misdirection of our national wealth. A sound economic order that would use our resources for the masses, free us of exploitation, and exercise aggressive goodwill toward our world neighbors would lead to drastic reductions in armament. We regret the recent naval demonstrations and reviews that contradict your pronouncements

for peace, and more especially your insistence in your Navy Day letter that the United States build up to treaty strength. Such a policy will lead to a more burdensome armament race among the nations. We strongly urge a permanent neutrality law that will include an embargo on shipments to belligerents of raw materials needed in the manufacture of weapons and munitions, and on loans and credits for war purposes. We also urge you to take active steps at once to seek co-operation with Japan in eliminating economic causes of war in the Pacific.

In the immediate future the conflict will grow even more bitter between big capital, working for the interests of the few stockholders, and the mass of workers and farmers who are demanding their share of the basic good things of life. We urge you to take drastic steps, in co-operation with your associates in government, to see that the standard of living of all people rises to the level made possible through socializing our potential resources. This improvement involves transferring the distribution of the necessities of life, as well as other consumption goods, to co-operatives. It involves the nationalization of the basic industries and the building of an inclusive trade union movement which will insure social justice to the workers.

To the extent that you take steps to make these fundamental changes we can and will support you. In so far as you are prepared to do these things, Mr. President, we feel that you will be serving the best interests of the American people.

Respectfully yours,

Professor Jerome Davis, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., chairman executive committee.

The Rev. Dr. Allan K. Chalmers, minister, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York.

John Haynes Holmes, minister, Community Church, New York.

Rabbi Sidney Goldstein, Free Synagogue, New York, chairman social justice commission of Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Edward L. Israel, Har Sinai congregation, Balitmore.

Professor Douglas C. Macintosh, Yale University Divinity School.

Professor Reinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Frank Olmstead, secretary intercollegiate branch, Y. M. C. A., New York.

The Rev. Dr. Willard E. Uphaus, executive secretary Religion and Labor Foundation, New Haven.

Professor Roland E. Bainton, Yale University Divinity School.

The Rev. A. Graham Baldwin, school minister, Philips Academy, Andover, Mass.

The Rev. Roswell P. Barnes, minister, University Heights Presbyterian Church, New York.

Professor William R. Barnhart, Hood College, Frederick, Md.

The Rev. Dr. Albert W. Beaven, president Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, and formerly president Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Professor John C. Bennett, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

Professor Robert L. Calhoun, Yale University Divinity School.

Eleanor Copenhaver, industrial secretary national board, Y. W. C. A., New York.

Dr. Abraham Cronbach, professor, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.

Ethel Davis, industrial secretary, Y. W. C. A., Chicago.

The Rev. Harold E. Fey, executive secretary Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York.

Professor Sherwood Gates, Hendricks College, Conway, Ark.

Dr. Ernest Graham Guthrie, general director of Chicago Congregational Union, Chicago.

Professor Erdman Harris, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. Herman J. Hahn, Salem Evangelical Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

Professor Walter M. Horton, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

Rev. J. B. Hunter, Pulaski Heights Christian Church, Little Rock, Ark.

Cecelia I. Jeffrey, general secretary, West Side Branch, Y. W. C. A., Chicago.

Rev. Paul Jones, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Professor Roger Kratz, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Reading, Pa.

Rev. Felix A. Manley, executive secretary, Council of Churches, New Haven.

Dr. Thornton W. Merriam, executive secretary, National Council on Religion in Higher Education.

Darwin J. Meserole, president, National Unemployed League, New York.

Ethelwyn Mills, secretary, treasurer, The Fellowship of Reconciliation, Pacific Coast Committee, Los Angeles.

Dr. Herbert A. Miller, professor of social economy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Claud Nelson, secretary, The Fellowship of Reconciliation, Southern region.

Celia Restow, chairman, Socialist local, New Haven.

Rev. Dr. Robert Searle, executive secretary, Greater New York Federation of Churches, New York.

Rev. H. Norman Sibley, the Wyoming Church, Millburn, N. J.

Tucker P. Smith, director, Brookwood Labor College, Katonah, N. Y.

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, Park Avenue Synagogue, New York.

Rev. Alfred W. Swan, minister, First Congregational Church, Madison, Wis.

Wellington H. Tinker, executive secretary, Intercollegiate Branch, Y. M. C. A., New York.

Rev. Eliot White, diocese of New York, Roselle, N. J.

Rev. Claude C. Williams, director, the New Era School, Little Rock, Ark.

Some Significant Findings

Of the 4,700 replies to a questionnaire sent to ministers of all faiths by the National Religion & Labor Foundation, 3,500 religious leaders throughout the United States have pledged themselves to support old age pensions, unemployment insurance and the Child Labor Amendment. Even more, 3,846 have agreed to support the right of freedom of speech, of assembly and the press by preaching public statement in forms, and by writing. Whenever strikes occur, almost as many will make an effort to get the facts so as to acquaint their congregations with them. This means that three-fourths of all the ministers replying have pledged themselves to the above actions.

Over 3,200 or seventy per cent, are willing to preach against lynching and agree to write their Congressmen that they are in favor of a Federal Anti-Lynching Law.

Over half, 2,400, favor government ownership of public utilities and basic industries, and will work through the press and the organiza-

tion of public meetings to bring about this change. Almost as many, 2,271, will appear before regional or city labor boards to aid in securing the full rights of labor in the local situation. Over 2,100 agree to support the legal and ethical right of labor to strike, picket and engage in mass demonstrations, when the cause of the workers is just. Seventeen hundred and fifty-six are willing to circulate literature favorable to the cause of organized labor among the members of their congregation.

While these findings are startling in their implications, there is a vast difference between the number who PLEDGED themselves to act IN THE FUTURE and those who HAVE ACTUALLY TAKEN such action IN THE PAST. In contrast to the total of three-fourths of the ministers who responded that they would support social insurance, the Child Labor Amendment, freedom of speech, and the investigation of labor disputes, only from six to twelve per cent HAD ACTUALLY DONE SO. Only seven per cent had worked for government ownership. Apparently most of these ministers hold RADICAL IDEALS but THEIR INTENTIONS in this social realm have not yet been translated into action.

While the vast majority of ministers are willing to get the facts in cases of industrial disputes, and almost half will support the legal and ethical right of labor to strike, picket and engage in mass demonstrations, comparatively few will join the picket line, or offer their churches or synagogues for strike meetings. However, almost half will encourage strikers by attending their meetings, and more than a third, by providing them with food, clothing, fuel and other basic necessities required to sustain a strike.

What they are now doing is shown in detail in the replies to Section XII. The largest percentage of action is in the form of pulpit preaching, forums, discussions, institutes and acts of charity. Only 2.9 per cent have taken fundamental action dealing with unemployment, and only 5.2 per cent have taken outstanding social action of any kind.

One-half the ministers declare they will persist in action for justice in economic and industrial relations, even if this means jeopardizing their position. All of this means that among the religious leaders of the United States there is a substantial array who are willing to pay a price for their convictions. In fact, of the 4,700 reporting, 313 had already paid a heavy price for action.

It must be remembered that the totals given here are for the ministers who responded. They do not necessarily represent the group which did not reply.

Mrs. Sun Yat Sen Appeals to America

The following from Mrs. Sun Yat Sen should find a quick response in the hearts of all Americans:

"To American Friends of the Chinese People:

"I earnestly appeal to you to start a vigorous campaign against American interference in China. . . The sending of munitions, airplanes, bombers, pilots, loans to the decadent and corrupt Nanking Government blatantly exposes the active collaboration of American imperialism in massacring millions of Chinese workers and peasants and further provoking and prolonging international chaos and destruction. American gunboats and cruisers in China's waters have repeatedly been used to hold Nanking in power against the revolutionary Chinese masses.

"In face of the Japanese militarist invasion of China, instead of fighting back the hostile imperialist armies, Nanking troops are ordered to turn their guns on their own countrymen, who heroically attempt to repel the invaders. With the aid of foreign arms and munitions, a foreign general staff, foreign airplanes and pilots, Nanking has destroyed hundreds of villages and towns, bombing women and children as well as men, leaving millions homeless.

"Japanese imperialist aggression in China is aided by international imperialism. . . The dismemberment of China looms threateningly before us, leading to world conflagration."

This letter is signed by the widow of Sun Yat Sen, China's famous leader. She is living beyond him in a new revolution. She is one of the "firmest and most enduring" of those striving for a free China. . . This appeal is addressed to all in America who believe in the rights of toiling workers and farmers to order their own lives, and is a warning that the crushing of the Chinese masses by imperialists will set the stage for world war.—Editors.

Where Logic Limps

As the Christmas season passes, one notices some peculiar things. For example, in a large store in New York City the liquor section was tastefully decorated with holly and Christmas colors, with a large decorative sign saying that in order to have true Christmas cheer, householders must be sure to have on hand an ample stock of liquors! The store made special prices "in the spirit of the season" so that Christmas joy might be unrestricted.

There is something jarring in that idea. Its logic limps badly. The Son of God came into the world to bring peace on earth, good will to men, to bring salvation to the sinful and the lost, and at this season that fact swings into prominence to be celebrated. In order to catch the spirit of it, to deepen the joy of it, there must be a large amount of ruinous drinking arranged! No, it is a peculiarly coarse commercializing of the season. To present to a friend a case of liquor in the spirit and name of Christ—it just cannot be done.

There is one possible value in this gross misuse of the season. It brings out anew that the liquor business is the same old selfish grasping thing it was before prohibition came and went. If temperance people learned any lessons during the years of prohibition, at least the liquor people did not. They are back at the old tricks—use anything as inducement to drink, use Christmas and the birth of Christ if necessary—anything to sell liquor. And such things are preparing the way for further strong hands to be laid on this least self-respecting business in the whole commercial category. The promises of repeal advocates have been cast to the winds as sensible men knew they would be when the old business was allowed to return to its old methods.

—*Presbyterian Tribune.*

Truth is never to be forsaken on any account, not even for the sake of one's country.

La FOLLETTE'S
GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
THE PROGRESSIVE
Regular Price $1.50 Per Year
A unique publication free from big business influence. No paid advertising. Facts suppressed by other papers exposed in every issue. Inside story of new Third Party. How the La Follettes would break the depression and solve our economic problems. Many more sensational features!
TWO BIG SPECIAL OFFERS
1 YEAR . . . (52 issues) $1
10 WEEKS . . . (10 issues) . . . 20c
Why do newspapers fool the public by distorting and suppressing news? Get the answer and the true facts from The Progressive!
Don't Miss The Next Few Startling Issues—Order Today!
THE PROGRESSIVE, DEPT. NB, MADISON, WISCONSIN